

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: OMMSSIONER FOR PATENTS 1.0. Bbx 1450 Alexaddria, Virginia 22313-1450 Www.usbio.gbx

APPLICATION NO		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,850		11/30/2001	Daniel J. Aldrich	1708	9608
21396	7590	06/05/2006		EXAMINER	
Sprint		XV A X /	TRUONG, LECHI		
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
OVERLA	ND PARK,	, KS 66251-2100	2194		
				DATE MAILED: 06/05/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/017,850	ALDRICH ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		LeChi Truong	2194					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failul Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tiruly will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 M	ay 2006.						
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 12-24</u> is/are pending in the aputa of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-8, 12-24</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.						
Applicati	on Papers							
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
* S		or the certified copies not receive	WILLIAM THOMSON WILLIAM THOMSON WISORY PATENT EXAMINER					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	·, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
2) Notice 3) Information	be of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D						

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-8, 11-14, 16-24 are presented for the examination. Claims 9-11, 15 are canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al (US. 6,353,819 B1) in view of McCormack et al (US. 5,181,171).

As to claim 1, Edwards teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a first architecture layer (the RAM Codegen Executor Component layer 204, col 5, ln 19/ Fig. 2), transparent layer (the record file manager component layer 206, col 5, ln 5-7/ Fig. 2), a second layer (the IO Random controller component layer 208, col 5, ln 20-25/ Fig. 2), the layer enabling the first layer and the second layer to communicate directly without having to communicate via the layer (col 2, ln 55-60/col 3, ln 13-17/col 5, ln 64-67/ col 9, ln 13-18)/ the record file manage component layer 206 is located between the layer 204 and 208 (Fig.2), the layer 206 is transparent layer since the communication between layer 204 and 208 can be performed by

bypassing or eliminating the layer 206 resulting in increases performance (col 3, ln 15-17/col 5, ln 64-68/col 6, ln 43-47/col 7, ln 1-5 and ln 20-25), architecture (component, col 2, ln 52-55).

Edward does not explicitly teach the plurality of transparent architecture layers.

However, Mccormack teaches the plurality of transparent architecture layer (The layer of nodes 44... is referred to as a middle, or hidden, layer, col 7, ln 3-10/ links with skip hidden layer in the network, col 25, ln 46-48/ reduction of the number links in the network 50 which is enabled by providing links 48 which skip the hidden layer of nodes, col 8, ln 64-68).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Edwards and Mccormack because Mccormack's component would improve the efficiency of Edwards's systems by allowing more rapid convergence during training of the network to optimize the performance of network.

3. Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al (US. 6,353,819 B1) in view of Beer (US. Patent 5,793,368), and further in view of Hayner et al (System and Method for Capturing Browser Session and User Actions).

As to claim 2, Edwards teaches a first layer object (the RAM Codegen Executor Component layer 204, col 5, ln 19/ Fig. 2), a transparent layer object (the record file manager component layer 206, col 5, ln 5-19/ Fig. 2), a second layer (the IO Random controller component layer 208, col 5, ln 20-25/ Fig. 2), the layer object configured to be hidden for communication between the first layer object and the second layer object/ the communication between each other by bypassing the layer (col 2, ln 55-60/col 3, ln 13-17/col 5, ln 9-19 and ln

54-67), a user interface attachable to the first layer object and configured to receive data, to transmit the data to the first layer object, to receive data from first layer object and to render the other object (input/out put units 16-1, col 3, ln 48-51/a user enter queries derived from a database query language, such as SQL, into the database in order to obtain or extract request data, col 1, ln 35-38/ Optimizer component 202 processes the SQL query, col 5, ln 42-45 and the data obtained for the query is to be returned to a user, col 5, ln 51-53).

Edwards does not teach a selected user interface type dynamically selectable and dynamically interchangeable from a plurality of user interface types. However, Beer teaches a selected user interface type dynamically selectable and dynamically interchangeable from a plurality of user interface types (dynamically switch between visual styles, col 2, ln 10-15/multiple selectable visual style, col 2, ln 43-46).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Edwards and Beer because Beer's dynamically switch between visual styles would improve the efficiency of Edwards's system by reducing security risks when loading applications from servers.

Edwards and Beer do not teach wherein the selected user interface type comprises at leat one member of a group consisting of a graphical user interface type, a web enabled interface, a handheld device interface, a voice simulation interface, a voice response interface, a voice activated interface, a voice recognition interface, and an audio interface. However, Hayner et al teaches wherein the selected user interface type comprises at least one member of a group consisting of a graphical user interface type, a web enabled interface, a handheld device interface, a voice simulation interface, a voice response interface, a voice activated interface, a

voice recognition interface, and an audio interface (The user interface is preferably a GUI (graphical user interface), but optional and more preferably is a Web browser interface.

Alternatively, the user interface is any type of interface which becomes altered upon receiving user input through a user input device, para[0007], ln 9-13/ para[0029], ln 5-13).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Edwards, Beer and Hayner because Hayner's at least one member of a group consisting of a graphical user interface type, a web enabled interface, a handheld device interface, a voice simulation interface, a voice response interface, a voice activated interface, a voice recognition interface, and an audio interface would improve the efficiency of Edwards and Beer's systems providing a solution to the problem of quality assurance/quality control of interactions between a user and an agent through a web site and/or other type of network interactions.

As to claim 3, Edwards teaches a group comprising a control message, data (col 5, ln 44-48).

As to claim 4, Edwards teaches the first layer object is configured to transmit the communication to the second layer object (col 5, ln 5-9).

As to claim 5, Edwards teaches the second layer object is configured to transmit the communication to the first layer object (col 8, ln 27-32).

As to claim 6, Edwards teaches collapse the transparent layer object when the first layer object and the second layer object relay the communication (col 2, ln 55-60/col 3, ln 13-17/col 5, ln 9-19 and ln 54-67).

As to claim 7, Edwards teaches a plurality of transparent layer objects (a multi-layered relational database manager, col 2, ln 49-50).

As to claim 8, Edward teaches configured the communication comprises data (col 5, ln 48-50).

4. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al (US. 6,353,819 B1) in view of McCormack et al (US. 5,181,171), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Rick (CA Ship Database-Management Suite For E-Commerce).

As to claim 12, Edwards and McCormack do not teach a plurality of databases, each database having a different database type. However, Rick teaches a plurality of databases, each database having a different database type (the oracle database... Sybase data bases, page 1, ln 22-23).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Edwards, McCormack and Rick because Rick's a plurality of databases and each database having a different database type would improve the efficiency of Edwards and McCormack's systems by providing greater availability single instance accessing a single database.

As to claim 13, Rick teaches a structured query language database, an Oracle database, a DB2 database, and an XML-based database (page 1, ln 22 -23).

5. Claims 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al (US. 6,353,819 B1) in view of Kung (US. Patent 5,933,837) in view of Beer (US. Patent 5,793,368) and further in view of Hayner et al (System and Method for Capturing Browser Session and User Actions).

As to claim 14, Edwards teaches an province configured (MFM component layer 206, col 8, ln 30-32), an action province configured with logic to process an action and to generate at least one query requesting data (col 5, ln 14-17/col 8, ln 53-56), query requesting data (col 5, ln 45-48), a yoke province (RAM Codegen Executor layer 204, col 5, ln 33), identify a database with a database type to which the query corresponds (col 5, ln 42-44), initiate a connection with the database to transmit the query to the database(col 5, ln 45-48), retrieve data in response to the query(col 5, ln 47-50), transmit the data to the action province(col 8, ln 29-32), a witness province(the Io Random Controller component layer 208, col 5, ln 20-21), the witness province configured to identify the action occurring via an input/output interface (col 5, ln 20-23), notify with the action at least one member of a group(col 8, ln 51-53), at least one layer configured to enable communication with a surrounding layer without having to communicate via the layer(col 2, ln 55-60/col 3, ln 13-17/col 5, ln 9-19 and ln 65-67).

Edwards do not explicit teach dynamically identify a database with a database type to which the query corresponds. However, Kung teaches dynamically identify a database with a database type to which the query corresponds (determines which of subscribe databases requires translations and subsequently translates the queries into appropriate formats based on the types of subscribing database models, col 3, ln 55-60/ predetermined or sample query descriptions that

can be used by query manager to construct queries appropriate for each of subscribing databases 122, 124, 126(fig.1), col 4, ln 64-67/ col 5, ln 1-5).

I would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Edwards and Kung because Kung's dynamically identify a database with a database type to which the query corresponds would improve the efficiency of Edward's system by providing a system that correctly propagates the update in the primary data only to subscribing databases that need to access.

Edwards and Kung do not teach a selected user interface type dynamically selectable and dynamically interchangeable from a plurality of user interface types. However, Beer teaches a selected user interface type dynamically selectable and dynamically interchangeable from a plurality of user interface types (dynamically switch between visual styles, col 2, ln 10-15/multiple selectable visual styles, col 2, ln 43-46).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Edwards, Kung and Beer because Beer's dynamically switch between visual styles would improve the efficiency of Edwards and Kung's systems by reducing security risks when loading applications from servers.

Edwards, Kung and Beer do not teach wherein the selected user interface type comprises at least one member of a group consisting of a graphical user interface type, a web enabled interface, a handheld device interface, a voice simulation interface, a voice response interface, a voice activated interface, a voice recognition interface, and an audio interface. However, Hayner et al teaches wherein the selected user interface type comprises at least one member of a group consisting of a graphical user interface type, a web enabled interface, a handheld device

interface, a voice simulation interface, a voice response interface, a voice activated interface, a voice recognition interface, and an audio interface (The user interface is preferably a GUI (graphical user interface), but optional and more preferably is a Web browser interface.

Alternatively, the user interface is any type of interface which becomes altered upon receiving user input through a user input device, para[0007], ln 9-13/ para[0029], ln 5-13).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Edwards, Kung, Beer and Hayner because Hayner's at least one member of a group consisting of a graphical user interface type, a web enabled interface, a handheld device interface, a voice simulation interface, a voice response interface, a voice activated interface, a voice recognition interface, and an audio interface would improve the efficiency of Edwards, Kung and Beer's systems providing a solution to the problem of quality assurance/quality control of interactions between a user and an agent through a web site and/or other type of network interactions.

As to claim 18, Edwards teaches the witness yoke province comprises a nomadic layer object configured to make a connection to the database and to pass the query to the database (col 5, ln 20-25/col 8, ln 44-46).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 16, 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. Claims 19-24 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomson, William can be reached on (571) 272 3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR of Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

May 26, 2006

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER